

Edouard Manet's horse-racing project

© Malcolm Park 2012

[PO Box 45, The Junction, NSW, 2291, AUSTRALIA; E-mail: mpark24@bigpond.com]

During his career Edouard Manet created numerous series of works based on particular themes, subjects or events. Although the extent of most of those projects is known, little is understood of a horse-racing project for which the common motif was the frontal view of a group of galloping racehorses. Notwithstanding its genesis in 1863, the imagery referenced neither the Old Masters nor Spain; rather, it reflected Manet's resolve to depict his contemporary world of modern Paris. It also marked his audacious first use of a deeply recessed space.¹ Records exist of paintings exhibited or observed during his lifetime and extant works include some small paintings, a watercolour, a lithograph, some sketches and a study drawing. But as the project typically involved the cutting of works, no large painting exists as testament to its importance. And even though Jean Harris's 1966 proposal that three fragments were cut from a larger canvas² justifiably influenced subsequent considerations, the project has remained a puzzle, with confusing canvas sizes, seemingly implausible dating, baffling layers of media, and stylistic contradictions.

Modelled on the sport in England, horse-racing in France commenced as an aristocratic pastime in the late eighteenth century and became popular during the Second Empire – particularly so with the 1857 inauguration of the *Hippodrome de Longchamp* (discussed here as 'Longchamp') in the Bois de Boulogne, the public park bordering the western edge of Paris.³ It has been previously thought that Manet was inspired by a French horse winning the 1864 Grand Prix de Paris at Longchamp and the project commenced with a painting intended for an exhibition at the Galerie Martinet⁴ in February 1865. In a letter to Louis Martinet,⁵ Manet referred to one of eight "new" paintings he was sending as "aspect d'une course au bois de Boulogne".⁶ It is not known if it was exhibited⁷ and no further reference to it has emerged. Evidence exists, however, that a year earlier, in February 1864, Manet exhibited in a Galerie Martinet group show a work listed as "Les Courses de Chantilly".⁸ That a work with a horse-racing subject was exhibited before 1865 and with reference to a track other than Longchamp's locale challenges all previous assumptions. It seems to have also made an appearance in deliberations for the 1864 Paris Salon. In late February of that year Manet unsuccessfully applied for

extra time to complete his *Dead Christ with Angels*,⁹ and on 2nd April a commentary on works being considered by the Salon jury noted his submitted works as "les *Courses de Chantilly* et la *Mort du Torreador* [sic]".¹⁰ However, before 22nd March Charles Baudelaire had sent a letter to the Marquis de Chennevières supporting Manet's two works, "un *Épisode d'une course de taureaux* et un *Christ ressuscitant, assisté par les anges*",¹¹ the two paintings subsequently shown in the Salon.¹² The circumstances of that 'appearance' of *Courses de Chantilly* cannot, as yet, be explained. Even though other paintings listed in the 1865 letter to Martinet could not have existed in February 1864,¹³ it is conceivable that the 1864 painting was resubmitted in 1865 as "new" if reworked and with identifiable elements from Longchamp included.

Events after 1865 shed little light on the project's evolution. In May 1867 Manet opened his solo exhibition at the Place de l'Alma in opposition to the establishment shows at the Exposition Universelle and Salon. One painting, *Les Courses au bois de Boulogne* (discussed here as '*Alma Painting*'), was catalogued with dimensions of 64 by 130 cm.¹⁴ Nothing else is known of the work. Adolphe Tabarant thought it and the 1865 Martinet work were one and the same¹⁵ but other scholars have concurred with Harris's problematic proposition that the *Alma Painting* was a fragment cut from that 1865 painting.¹⁶ In late 1871 or early 1872 an inventory of paintings in Manet's studio valued a *Les Courses* (discussed here as '*Inventory Painting*') at 8,000 Fr,¹⁷ the same for two early works, *La Nymphe* (1859–61, RW.I-40¹⁸) measuring 146 by 114 cm., and *Le vieux musicien* (1862, RW.I-52) measuring 190 by 251 cm. Even though the *Alma Painting* was markedly smaller than those two works, Harris thought the *Inventory Painting* part of the *Alma Painting*¹⁹ and Charles Moffett thought the *Inventory Painting* was the *Alma Painting*.²⁰ Unless a valuation error was made, neither of those proposals seems feasible and some other explanation is required.

Manet's 1876 studio exhibition²¹ included a painting "*Courses à Longchamps* [sic]",²² and an eponymous work shown in the 1884 posthumous Manet retrospective exhibition²³ was noted in 1902 by Théodore Duret, a friend of Manet, to be then held in a Chicago private collection.²⁴ Although that work, *Courses à Longchamp* (discussed below as the *Chicago Painting*), can be confidently assumed the one exhibited in 1876, its dating raises the kind of contradiction that exists with all of the project's works. Even though, as discussed below, the painting has an inscribed date of 1866, it was listed in the 1884 exhibition catalogue as a work of 1871.²⁵ The exhibition's organising committee, comprising

many of Manet's family and friends,²⁶ would have been familiar with the work's chronology and Frederick Delius, who had bought it from Manet in 1877, would have been aware the dating was different from that on the work. Either the committee assigned such a date knowing it had been painted in its final form in 1871 and Manet had backdated it or, alternatively, the inscribed date of 1866 did not exist in 1884. Subsequently, Duret dated it at 1871–1872,²⁷ Tabarant at 1864,²⁸ Harris at "1865, 1867, or 1869",²⁹ and Theodore Reff³⁰ and most scholars since at 1867. The date of its actual creation and the circumstances of the inscription remain unresolved.

Another problematic work is considered here of possible importance in understanding the fragments cut from one large canvas. An entry in Manet's account book for the year 1880 of "Courses...Ephrussi...1000^F"³¹ reveals that Charles Ephrussi, a friend of Manet,³² had bought a small horse-racing painting. Its subject and probable size are relevant here but no other record of it exists.

KNOWN WORKS

i) Louvre Drawing

An unsigned and undated graphite and wash drawing, *Races at Longchamp*, (Fig.7, RW.II-544; discussed here as '*Louvre Drawing*') shows the frontal view of a group of racehorses and their jockeys. Such a view exists in one form or another in all the extant works and has been claimed by scholars, even though earlier frontal views by other artists existed,³³ as the first break from the traditional 'flying gallop' side view.³⁴ The *Louvre Drawing*'s image of five horses, which also appears in two small paintings (*Washington Painting* and *Lochard Painting*, discussed below), is also seen by scholars as a later extraction from three other works which depict six horses (*Cambridge Watercolour*, *Lithograph*, and *Chicago Painting*, discussed below) and, as such, considered more dynamic.³⁵

For this writer the converse is the case, with the *Louvre Drawing* considered the work in which Manet first brought to fruition his frontal view image. The group of six horses, as seen in the *Chicago Painting*, is compact and full of dynamic action with the horses racing directly towards the viewer, the jockeys leaning forward in concentration and the heads of the central four jockeys looking directly to the front. In contrast, the five horses of the *Louvre Drawing* and related works are a loose, diffuse group with no sense of vigorous energy and the jockeys look around nonchalantly. When considered separately and disconnected to the lower forelegs, the horses in fact appear as if standing still or moving slowly; and their forelegs, in the 'flying gallop' mode, don't relate as feasible pairs to the

horses above them. The drawing is considered a composite of separate parts copied by transfer from unknown sources and integrated into a single image with the overlaid curved band of hatched lines.

ii) Sketches

A series of quickly drawn sketches of a racecourse shows groups of spectators standing behind track barriers or seated in their carriages. Three of those include a summarily drawn background hill outline, as seen in Fig.10 (RW.II-545, discussed here as '*Sketch No.1*').³⁶ Another sketch, showing a marquee and the outline of a background hill, is identified here as a further study (verso of RW.II-494, not catalogued).³⁷ The only indicator of a specific locale in any of the sketches is the hill outline.

iii) Lochard Painting

A painting photographed by Fernand Lochard after Manet's death in 1883 (Fig.8; RW.I-96, discussed here as '*Lochard Painting*') depicts the horses shown in the *Louvre Drawing* and includes an angled track barrier behind the horse at the right.³⁸ As discussed below, one of the fragments thought cut from the same canvas as the *Cincinnati Painting* and *Cognacq Painting* depicted such an image. However, and even though photographs of paintings from that epoch can be deceptive, the *Lochard Painting* appears more of a sketch than either the *Cincinnati Painting* or *Cognacq Painting* and is an unlikely related fragment. Its image has been thought part of the distillation from those of six horses, with Reff thinking the *Louvre Drawing* was possibly traced from it.³⁹ In contrast, it is considered here the first translation of the *Louvre Drawing*'s image into paint. Its present location is unknown and it remains a work not yet studied. Although the photograph confirms Manet created its format, the barrier in the same location as in the *Washington Painting* and the cutting of the jockeys' heads at the top edge suggest it was originally a larger canvas.

iv) Washington Painting

With the understanding that the *Louvre Drawing* was the seminal image, any work displaying the same five horses could be assumed an early work. One, considered here derived from the *Lochard Painting*, is the small painting *At the Races* (Fig.9; RW.I-97; discussed here as '*Washington Painting*'). With its small size it could have been the 1864 Martinet exhibition painting, but not the one initially submitted to the 1864 Salon. It has been thought by scholars to post-date the *Chicago Painting* – with Reff seeing it as the "final stage in Manet's progressive concentration and simplification of his image"⁴⁰ – and variously dated from 1864 to 1877.⁴¹ There is, however, something of a pictorial

contradiction evident in the work and claims for such diverse datings may be correct. Physical examination shows that the horses and jockeys are painted in a manner that fits directly into Manet's mid-1860s period. In contrast, the areas of the racecourse setting are painted with a lighter palette and looser brushwork closer to his 1874 and later period and clearly overlap the majority of the edges of the horses and jockeys.⁴² Although the reworking has created spatial confusion with different eye levels for the horses, the track barriers and the grandstand roof, the X-radiograph shows the barrier on the right initially carried back much farther to an eye level related to that of the horses. Consequently, the barrier at the left, if included, would have been more vertical in perspective.

Whether it was the 1864 Martinet exhibition painting titled *Les Courses de Chantilly* or not, the *Washington Painting's* original setting was probably the racecourse at Chantilly. By the mid-1860s the *Hippodrome de Chantilly* (discussed here as 'Chantilly') was well established and meetings held during 1863 provide possible occasions for Manet.⁴³ The track's configuration at the time (Fig.1) would have provided a view from viewpoint *P1* of horses in the finish straight turning to their right and trees of the adjacent Forêt de Chantilly beyond the barrier at the right and the end of the finish straight, as seen in the painting.⁴⁴ A photograph taken from viewpoint *P2* at the present-day hippodrome (Fig.2) shows a finish straight and bend and the forest at the right, as would have been similarly seen from *P1* in the 1860s. Taking those aspects into account, a proposed initial composition for the painting is shown in Fig.20 (*Second Painting: Stage 1*). Contemporary photographs also show the track was much wider than that depicted by Manet – a characteristic he carried through all the subsequent images to enhance the dynamic action.

v) Cambridge Watercolour and Cambridge Drawing

The key work to understand the project is the extant watercolour and gouache *Race Course at Longchamp* (Fig.14; RW.II-548, recto; discussed here as '*Cambridge Watercolour*'), which shows an expansive view of a racecourse setting and a group of six racehorses. It exists in its present form on two joined sheets – although a physical examination indicates that it existed initially as a single sheet which was cut and reconnected at a later stage⁴⁵ – and is signed and dated 1864, somewhat atypically. Harris believed the complete work was created after the 1865 Martinet exhibition painting "as a reproduction or reworking of the original oil painting",⁴⁶ while Reff thought the right-hand sheet a

study for that painting and the left-hand sheet a later addition.⁴⁷ Although devoid of the light touch evident in many later watercolours, its depiction of the horse-race spectacle has a striking realism.⁴⁸

The racehorses provide an important point of comparison with the *Louvre Drawing*, *Lochard Painting* and *Washington Painting*. There are now six horses, they race vigorously straight towards the viewer rather than negotiating a bend to their right – even though seemingly approaching one, and they are set back away from the immediate foreground into the recessed track space. The panoramic view, comprising the open space at the left, the spectators in the centre and the horses at the right, is unified by the background hill. At the right, trees are aligned along the track, used as a visual stop to the track's plunging perspective, and, at the upper level, set on a receding, steep hillside beyond the racecourse. And what has been previously identified as the roof of the southern public grandstand at Longchamp is cut at the image's right edge.

Reference to Longchamp in its title raises an important question. Except for the Chantilly reference in the 1864 paintings, Longchamp (or the wider locale of the Bois de Boulogne) is the only other venue in the titles of other known works, whether given by Manet or later scholars. For Manet, the inclusion of the popular and fashionable Longchamp would have been both opportunistic and typically deflective. And although most scholars have presumed or accepted that the racecourse related to Longchamp,⁴⁹ the background hill in the *Cambridge Watercolour* is not seen from Longchamp in any direction. A layout plan (Fig.3)⁵⁰ shows the track as it then existed and its present-day configuration, and a computer-generated view (Fig.4) from viewpoint P3 – the approximate location of a vantage point against the outside track barrier in Manet's time – depicts the then existing track, track barriers and grandstands, the narrow band of distant hills to the south,⁵¹ and the closer hill of Saint-Cloud at the right just to the left of the grandstands. A line drawing made after the watercolour overlaid this image demonstrates that the skyline forms don't relate.

It is certainly possible that Manet simply created the hill, but a search of the topography surrounding racecourses of that time around Paris and on the English Channel coast identified it as that seen to the north from the present-day *Hippodrome de Maisons-Laffitte* (discussed here as 'Maisons-Laffitte') – on the left bank of the river Seine, some twelve kilometres to the north of Longchamp – and at which a *champ de courses* as shown on the layout plan (Fig.5) existed in Manet's time.⁵² The first event was held there in 1828⁵³ and a series of meetings held in the early 1860s are of interest

here.⁵⁴ A present-day photograph (Fig.6) from viewpoint *P4* – as would have been available in 1864 – shows in the background the hill ridge of the Forêt Régionale des Buttes du Parisis,⁵⁵ and at the right the steep hillside just beyond the river's right bank. A line drawing made after the watercolour overlaid the photograph at a different eye-level shows a correlation with the background hill – particularly at the steep section of terrain at *b*, but with a slight variation at its summit⁵⁶ – as well as the receding hillside at the right. Although the hill outlines from the sketches don't relate exactly to the view, the recording of the steep section in such quick notations suggests they were made at Maisons-Laffitte.

An important pictorial element is the barrier at the left with its stakes and restraining strands. It has been previously thought to relate to the racetrack bend seen in the two fragments which Harris thought cut from the 1865 Martinet exhibition painting, the *Cincinnati Painting* and *Cognacq Painting* (both discussed below). But whereas the stakes in the watercolour are vertical, those in the fragments are angled away from the track, suggesting a different track configuration. Another work with vertical stakes is the *Lithograph* (see below), made subsequent to the watercolour. When, as shown in Fig.17, a line drawing made after the watercolour is overlaid the reversed image of the *Lithograph* – with both at their exact relative sizes – many parts of their images correlate.⁵⁷ Importantly, and although the barrier in the *Lithograph* continues onto its extended format below the watercolour, the ground line of the barrier, for the extent that it exists in the watercolour and as articulated by the bases of the posts, provides an exact match.⁵⁸ With such a correspondence it is likely that the track in the watercolour was straight as in the *Lithograph*, rather than formed with a bend. An infra-red reflectogram (Fig.15) confirms the strands are a continuation of a straight alignment and reveals that the stake at *c* had earlier extended to the bottom edge of the sheet and another stake at *d*, now not visible, also extended to the bottom edge – suggesting the original format was extended beyond that edge. If the watercolour and *Lithograph* formats had been the same or similar, as their exact image sizes suggest, then the barrier ground line in the *Lithograph* would reflect what existed in the earlier watercolour's larger format. The dimensions of that initial work (discussed here as '*Watercolour*') would have been 36.5 by 56.6 cm.

Although, as proposed in Fig.20 (*Watercolour: Stage 1*), the basic elements of its composition – including the background hill, racing horses and spectators – were derived from the *Third Painting: Stage 2*, it was a study in imagery development. The shift towards a focus on the horses and the

elimination of the track bend were the result. One uncertain element is the cream-coloured area seen on the steep hillside at the right. In the later *Lithograph* and *Chicago Painting* its form became more defined, as if a tower. No such structure existed on the hillside at Maisons-Laffitte, but the building of a spire to the church at Saint-Cloud in 1865–66 coincided with the project's development and may have influenced that motif's appearance.⁵⁹

An unsigned, undated drawing on the verso of the *Cambridge Watercolour's* left-hand sheet (RW.II-548, verso; discussed here as '*Cambridge Drawing*') shows the cantilevered grandstand roof together with outlines of a background hill and an extremely tall tree. Apparently created after the vertical cut was made, it shows no qualities of a direct sketch and the hill relates to neither Longchamp nor Maisons-Laffitte. An apparent dimensional notation inscribed on the right-hand sheet's verso, "76 x 44", is shown below to be important in the sequence that created the *Chicago Painting*.

vi) Lithograph

In addition to being a study after the watercolour, as discussed above, the wondrous lithograph *The Races* (Fig.16; Harris-41;⁶⁰ discussed here as 'Lithograph') is seen as the *tour de force* that established, with its integration of the barrier and crowd into one cohesive element, the compositional focus on the racehorses. Not published in Manet's lifetime, it is yet another work with uncertain dating – set variously by scholars between 1864 and the late 1870s. With its imagery developed after the watercolour but created before that work was cut – that is, as discussed below, before May 1867 – the *Lithograph* is dated here at 1865–67.

vii) Cincinnati Painting

Prior to Harris's proposal that two small fragments, *Women at the Races* and *The Grounds of the Racetrack at Longchamp*, together with the *Alma Painting*, were cut from a larger painting, they were considered independent works. As the only fragment able to be examined, *Women at the Races* (Fig.11; RW.I-95; discussed here as '*Cincinnati Painting*') provides a limited window into the larger canvas even if its existing image is not as first created or when subsequently cut.⁶¹ Not exhibited by Manet, it has been previously dated at 1863, 1864, and 1865. Examination under a microscope revealed that the inscribed date of '1866'⁶² and signature had been added after the underlying paint had dried and age cracks in their paint layer showed they weren't recent additions. Unfortunately that does not establish when they were added or the existing image was created.

Its image depicts two women holding parasols standing behind a barrier articulated by an angled stake and restraining strands. The half-figure of possibly a small boy with a cap leaning on a strand is cut at the right edge. The examination and X-radiographs showed the overpainting is extensive and that Manet treated the fragment as an independent work. Although the painting of the dresses, green parasol and foreground turf are characteristic of Manet's technique during the 1860s and are probably the original layer, the dark areas around the figures would hardly have existed in the original daylight setting and seem introduced to set in relief the two colourful figures. Additionally, many details, such as the way the strands interweave the two figures and the carriage wheels are painted over other elements, confuse any possible understanding of the paint layer sequence.

With the canvas support cut on all four edges, lined, tacked to a stretcher frame, and finished all round with a paper edge, there is no original tacking margin to show what may have existed in the surrounding areas before the cutting. But as no cusping is evident, no tacking edges of the larger canvas were close to the present cut edges. Most revisions seem to have been made at least before the paper edge was fixed, if not before the canvas was cut. Importantly, a weave count confirms its canvas is different to that of the *Chicago Painting*.

A comparison with the *Cambridge Watercolour* imagery shows the woman on the right was replaced by a top-hatted man in the watercolour in a much more condensed space, and the presumed figure of a boy at the right is not evident in the watercolour. An important compositional difference is the watercolour's markedly lower eye level.

viii) Cognacq Painting

The other fragment referred to by Harris, *The Grounds of the Racetrack at Longchamp* (Fig.12; RW.I-94; discussed here as '*Cognacq Painting*'),⁶³ also shows two women spectators holding parasols and standing behind a barrier, as seen in the later *Cambridge Watercolour*. The rear view of a top-hatted man and a carriage with its passenger(s) and a parasol set behind the woman whose back we see was used to the left of the closest woman spectator in the watercolour. There appears to be three restraining strands rather than the two of the *Cincinnati Painting*, and a pronounced change in direction of the upper strand suggests the prior existence of a stake at that position, as also seen in the watercolour.

As the painting's present location is unknown it has not been studied and no details of its canvas or paint layers are available. With only black and white reproductions existing in the public domain, it is difficult to compare it with the *Cincinnati Painting* in terms of painterly technique or revisions. It seems, however, not to have the overpainting of its background and its surface is less lively. Duret dated it at 1865⁶⁴ and most scholars have accepted that date.

ix) Horse/Jockey Painting and Ephrussi Painting

Harris's proposal that the third fragment cut from the larger painting included the horses at the right as existed in the *Cambridge Watercolour* seems completely valid. Nevertheless, her proposal that the *Alma Painting* provided that part of the image produces insurmountable imagery scale problems. And the sketch appearance of the *Lochard Painting* suggests it to be a preliminary work and not from the same canvas. However, the existence of a small painting (discussed here as '*Horse/Jockey Painting*'), which shows the horse and jockey at the far right of the group of horses in the *Lochard Painting*, presents an intriguing, but also problematic, solution. In one black-and-white photograph of the work held in the Musée d'Orsay,⁶⁵ the leg of the jockey on the adjacent horse in the *Lochard Painting* is seen; but in a published colour reproduction of the same work⁶⁶ that leg has been painted out. No records exist of this particular work, it has no provenance, its present location cannot be established, and its authenticity as a Manet work is by no means certain. However, the fact that a 'leg' that exists in the known imagery was overpainted to isolate the horse and jockey from a recognisable context is a compelling circumstance.

Notwithstanding the difficulties in making assessments from reproductions, the figure of the horse and the legs of the jockey are seen to relate directly to the painted qualities of the horses and jockeys in the *Washington Painting* and to a similar degree of finish to the *Cognacq Painting*. But the torso, shoulders and arms of the jockey and the track barrier behind him can all be easily rejected as from Manet's hand. With the overpainting of the adjacent jockey's leg, the track surface must also be considered doubtful. Such an appraisal leads to the possibility that the *Horse/Jockey Painting* is a fragment cut from a canvas that related to the format of the *Lochard Painting*, had a level of finish that initially related to the *Cognacq Painting*, and was then partly repainted. Not only could that larger canvas have been itself a fragment from the same canvas from which the *Cincinnati Painting* and *Cognacq Painting* were cut, but, if so, it could also be the painting titled *Courses* that, as noted above,

was sold in 1880 to Charles Ephrussi for 1,000 Fr (discussed here as '*Ephrussi Painting*').⁶⁷ That amount is comparable with two other paintings sold by Manet in that period: one to Delius in 1877, the *Chicago Painting*, with dimensions of 43.8 by 83.9 cm., for 1,000 Fr; and, the other to Ephrussi in 1880, *Une botte d'asperges*, with dimensions of 44 by 54 cm, for which he charged 800 Fr but received 1,000 Fr.⁶⁸ If the *Ephrussi Painting* was the third fragment cut from the *Third Painting*, a composition proposal is shown in Fig.13 and its location within the larger canvas is shown in Fig.20 (*Third Painting: Stage 4*). Apart from the fact that it fits the jigsaw puzzle, the lack of evidence makes such a proposition wholly hypothetical; but the possibility highlights the need for the *Horse/Jockey Painting* to be examined.

x) Chicago Painting

The largest extant painting and the work seen here as the masterly climax of the project's evolution is *Courses à Longchamp* (Fig.18; RW.I-98; discussed here as '*Chicago Painting*'). Thought in more recent times to be a study for the 1867 *Alma Painting*, that hypothesis explains neither the fate of the *Alma Painting* nor the physical evidence available from its canvas. Importantly, its canvas weave count is different to that of the *Cincinnati Painting*. However its inscribed date, considered previously as '1867', is shown with microscope examination to be '1866', the same as on the *Cincinnati Painting*.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the fact that, as noted above, the painting was included in the 1884 retrospective catalogue as an 1871 work leaves unresolved the date when it was actually completed.

It is clear the painting's composition was influenced by the right-hand sheet of the *Cambridge Watercolour* and the inscribed notation of '76 x 44' on that sheet's verso provides evidence of their connection. The painting's height of 43.8 cm. equates to the '44' and, although its width of 83.9 cm. is greater than the '76', the dimensions suggest that Manet decided the painting's size once the right-hand sheet was determined as its model. The major compositional difference between the two works is the reduced extent of racetrack in the watercolour's foreground.

Examination of the canvas has provided important information about its previous state(s). Its right edge is the only original tacking edge, showing it was cut from the right-hand section of a larger canvas. Those three other tacking edges also show the image was reworked after being secured to a stretcher at its present size. The difference in pigment colours between the original layer(s) visible on the tacking edges and the layer on the final painted surface indicates that much of the image had been

reworked, with the possible exception of the crowds. An X-radiograph reveals, however, the reworking introduced only a few changes: at the upper left the background hill had been set higher; and, in the lower left corner the original woman holding a parasol in front of her was refigured and her parasol became the dress bustle of the woman next to her. The parasol of the second woman was also altered.

Although the top and bottom tacking edges show little more than an extension of the sky and grassed surface, the left tacking edge provides an important indicator of the larger canvas from which the work was cut (Fig.19). At the crowd's upper outline, a top-hatted coachman can be identified on that tacking edge, at *e*. A comparison between the compositions of the watercolour and the painting's X-radiograph reveals that the women spectators in the lower left corner of the painting had been originally created at a larger scale than they existed in the watercolour in comparison to the racehorses and barriers to the right – suggesting that those parts of a larger canvas to the left of the *Chicago Painting* format may have also been painted at the larger scale. Accordingly, the crowd's upper outline may have continued to the left at a higher level. The figure of the man on the tacking edge confirmed such an assessment. In the watercolour, the man with the binoculars is above the two seated coachmen – yet in the painting he is below the coachman on the tacking edge. Its proposed composition prior to the final reworking is seen in Fig.20 (*Fourth Painting: Stage 3*).

SEQUENCE OF WORKS

The sequence of imagery influence and development described here is illustrated in Fig.20.

The project commenced with the on-site sketches and the frontal view of five racing horses constructed in the *Louvre Drawing*. The *Lochard Painting* is considered the first sketch translation of that image into paint as the *First Painting*. The initial setting of two other paintings was Chantilly. One, proposed here in its initial form as the *Second Painting: Stage 1*, set the group of five horses into a racecourse setting and with its small size could have been the 1864 Martinet exhibition painting. Later reworked, it is the extant *Washington Painting (Second Painting: Stage 2)*. The other is the proposed *Third Painting*. In its initial *Stage 1* form with its view of Chantilly, it is more likely than the *Washington Painting* to have been the 1864 Martinet exhibition painting and is probably the initial submission to the 1864 Salon. And if reworked in its *Stage 2* form, it would have been the "new" painting resubmitted to the 1865 Martinet exhibition. In that form its image was a composite, with the

track from Chantilly; the group of five racehorses about to negotiate the bend from the *Second Painting: Stage 1*; the background hill, spectators at the left, and marquee from the sketches made at Maisons-Laffitte; and, the finish post,⁷⁰ banner, and grandstand roof from Longchamp. With its approximate dimensions of 160 by 260 cm.⁷¹ it is also considered the *Inventory Painting* of 1871–72 (*Third Painting: Stage 3*) and the painting from which three fragments, the *Cincinnati Painting*, *Cognacq Painting* and proposed *Ephrussi Painting*, were subsequently cut (*Third Painting: Stage 4*). Such a proposition can only be sustained, however, if their canvas supports are identical. Of course, the problematic date of 1866 on the *Cincinnati Painting* provides a question mark.

Adjustments to the imagery derived from the *Third Painting: Stage 2* were first made with the *Watercolour: Stage 1* (assessed dimensions: 36.6 by 56.6 cm.) in which the viewpoint was lowered, the racetrack bend eliminated, and the horses, although set back farther into the track's plunging space, depicted racing more vigorously directly towards the viewer; then, subsequently with the *Lithograph* in which the crowd and barrier became one cohesive visual element. The outcome from those two studies was the creation of a second large canvas, the *Fourth Painting: Stage 1* (assessed dimensions: 89 by 138 cm). To direct the focus towards the group of horses, progressive cuts to its canvas were made at *Stage 2*, creating the *Alma Painting* of 1867 (known dimensions: 64 by 130 cm.), and *Stage 3*, forming the canvas for the reworked final painting at *Stage 4*, the *Chicago Painting*, which was painted at some time between 1868 and 1872. Those progressive cuts were influenced by prior respective cuts to the *Watercolour* at *Stage 2*, creating the *Cambridge Watercolour* format, and *Stage 3*, reducing it to the right-hand sheet.

That none of the larger works still exists has contributed to our limited understanding of the horse-racing project's importance within Manet's oeuvre.⁷² And with our minimal knowledge of the *Lochard Painting*, *Cognacq Painting*, and *Horse/Jockey Painting* it is essential, if extant, that they are examined. If that becomes possible, then the framework of connections established here with the new information and proposals may enable a full understanding of this major project from such an important artist of the nineteenth century to be realised.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The cooperation of the curators and conservators of those institutions at which the Manet works were examined is gratefully acknowledged. They include: Gloria Groom, Allison Langley and Frank Zuccari at The Art Institute of Chicago; Stephen Bonadies, Megan Emery and Andy Haslit at the Cincinnati Art Museum; Ann Hoenigswald, Kimberly Jones and the late Philip Conisbee at the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC; and, Anne Driesse and Miriam Stewart at the Fogg Museum, Harvard Art Museums, Cambridge MA. I also acknowledge the excellent assistance from Darren McKimm with the computer-generated illustrations and Julia McLaren and Bronwen Pugsley with research in and around Paris.

I am also indebted to many individuals and institutions for their cooperation with the research, including: Nicole Garnier (Musée Condé, Chateau de Chantilly); Isabelle Deniard (Bibliothèque de Chantilly); André Bergery (Chantilly); Patrimoine de Chantilly; Christian Delporte (Hippodrome de Longchamp); Mme Déchenel (Hippodrome de Maisons-Laffitte); Florence de la Roncière (Chateau de Maisons, Maisons-Laffitte); Muriel Bessot (Archives-Documentation, Mairie, Corneilles-en-Parisis); Les Gardiens du Fort de Corneilles; Pascale Lecauchois (Bibliothèque, Jockey Club, Paris); Sophie Pietri (Wildenstein Institute, Paris); Jean Hourseau, local historian (La Frette-sur-Seine); Martine Clément, historian and author; Jacques Barreau, historian and author; Juliet Wilson-Bareau, art historian (London); María Isabel Molestina Triviño (The Morgan Library & Museum, New York); Lauranne Neveu (Musée Marmottan Monet, Paris); Bibliothèque and Documentation de la Conservation, Musée d'Orsay, Paris; Département des Arts graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris; and, Département des Estampes et de la Photographie, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.

NOTES

1. In contrast, a characteristic of Manet's spatial handling that limited spatial recession involved the pictorial space parallel with the picture plane. The concept of a plunging space was not revisited until the Rue Mosnier series of 1878.
2. J.C. Harris, 'Manet's Race-track Paintings', *The Art Bulletin*, 48/1, March, 1966, pp.78–82; Figs.1–8, n.p.
3. For a chronological history of horse-racing in France, see K. Jones, 'Chronology', in J.S. Boggs, *Degas at the Races*, exh. cat., National Gallery of Art, Washington, and Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1998, pp.224–39. For a description of horse-racing as part of Parisian life at the time, see R.L. Herbert, *Art, Leisure and Parisian Society*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988, 'At the Racetrack', pp.152–70.
4. Louis Martinet opened his gallery at 26 boulevard des Italiens in 1859. Manet first exhibited there with three paintings at separate times during 1861 and then held his first major show in March 1863, exhibiting fourteen works.

5. For a reproduction and translation of the letter, see J. Wilson-Bareau, *Manet by Himself*, Little, Brown and Company, London 1995, Fig.10, p.32. Wilson-Bareau assessed it to have been written on 15–17th February. Manet also wrote in a letter to Charles Baudelaire dated "Mardi 14" that "je vais envoyer chez Martinet qui va ouvrir dimanche son exposition neuf toiles *inédites*"; see C. Pichois, ed., *Lettres à Charles Baudelaire*, Études Baudelairiennes IV-V, Éditions de la Baconnière, Neuchâtel 1973, p.230; translation by Wilson-Bareau, *ibid.*, p.31.
6. The exhibition, *Exposition des œuvres inédites des sociétaires*, was organised by the Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts.
7. In a letter to Charles Baudelaire dated 21st February, Hippolyte Lejosne wrote "Je n'ai pas vu Manet depuis quelques jours. ... Il vient de retirer ses tableaux de l'exposition Martinet; il en avait envoyé 6, on n'en avait encore placé que deux."; see Pichois, *op. cit.* (note 5), p.215; translation by C.S. Moffett, '99. Races at Longchamp', in F. Cachin, et al., *Manet 1832-1833*, exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and Harry N. Abrams Inc., New York, 1983, pp.263, 264-n.6, but letter is incorrectly dated 12th February.
8. Catalogue entry: "165: Manet – Les Courses de Chantilly". The group exhibition, the *première exposition inédite* of the *Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts*, opened on 4th February 1864. Martinet had earlier established the *Société* in March 1862, and its *Cercle artistique* in August 1863. The exhibition opening was reported in *Le Courrier artistique* (Martinet's own publication first issued in 1861) on 7th February with Manet listed under "Peintures et Dessinateurs". The printed date on the exhibition catalogue's cover (a copy is held in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des Estampes et de la Photographie, Paris) is not clear and could be easily mistaken as "1884" and not "1864", as has occurred with a photocopy held at the Documentation de la Conservation, Musée d'Orsay. Carol Armstrong has noted that "Manet had works in group shows at Martinet's in 1864 and 1865" but provided no details; see C. Armstrong, *Manet Manette*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London 2002, p.338-n.2.
9. Manet applied to Comte de Nieuwerkerke, Surintendant des Beaux-Arts; see Archives des Musées nationaux, Paris: Salon de 1864, Correspondance (artistes), fol.59; cited in: T. Reff, *Manet's 'Incident in a Bullfight'*, The Frick Collection, New York, 2005, p.48-n.127.
10. "J.L.", 'Bruits du Salon', *L'Union des arts* (2nd April 1864), third page; cited in Reff, *op. cit.* (note 9), p.48-n.127.
11. C. Pichois, ed., *Baudelaire Correspondance. II (mars 1860 – mars 1866)*, Gallimard, Paris, 1973, pp.350–51.
12. Catalogued as '1281 – Les anges au tombeau du Christ' and '1282 – Épisode d'une course de taureaux' – clearly the renamed *Mort du Torreador* noted in the 'Bruits du Salon' article (see note 10).
13. One was "l'Espada mort", a work cut from the *Épisode d'une course de taureaux* exhibited in the Paris Salon of May 1864. Another was "la mer le navire fédéral Kerseage [*sic*] en rade de

- Boulogne-sur-mer", which could only have been painted during or after July 1864 when the U.S.S. "Kearsarge" was anchored off Boulogne-sur-Mer. For the letter details, see note 5.
14. *Catalogue des Tableaux de M. Édouard Manet exposés Avenue de l'Alma en 1867*, exh. cat., Paris (Manet's private pavilion), 1867, no.25, p.12.
 15. A. Tabarant, *Manet: Histoire catalographique*, Editions Mouton, Paris, 1931, p.137.
 16. Harris, *op cit.* (note 2), p.80.
 17. It would seem the inventory list of paintings made by Manet in a notebook was created at the same time as the sale of over twenty paintings to the art dealer Durand-Ruel, as no work is noted on both the sale and inventory lists. For details of the inventory list see D. Rouart and D. Wildenstein, *Edouard Manet: Catalogue raisonné*, La Bibliothèque des Arts, Lausanne and Paris 1975, I, pp.17, 18.
 18. Notations 'RW.I' and 'RW.II' refer to Volumes 1 and 2, respectively, for catalogue numbers in Rouart and Wildenstein, *op. cit.* (note 17).
 19. Harris, *op cit.* (note 2), p.80.
 20. Moffett claimed the Alma Painting was "seen for the last time in 1871"; see Moffett, in Cachin, et al., *op.cit.* (note 7), p.263.
 21. In response to the rejection of two works by the 1876 Paris Salon jury, Manet held his *exposition particulière* in his studio at 4, rue de Saint-Pétersbourg from 15th April to 1st May.
 22. The painting was noted by a correspondent, "J. de Paris", in his review of the exhibition: 'Nouvelles Diverses: L'Atelier de Manet', *Le Figaro*, 19th April, 1876, p.2.
 23. The retrospective exhibition was held at the École Nationale des Beaux-Arts in Paris, opening in January, 1884.
 24. T. Duret, *Histoire de Édouard Manet et de son œuvre*, H. Floury, Paris, 1902, no.142, p.228. The collection in Chicago was that of Mrs. Potter Palmer.
 25. Listed in the 1884 *Exposition Manet* catalogue under 1871 as "61. – Courses à Longchamps.\ Appartient à M. Delius.", n.p.
 26. The committee included Manet's stepson Léon Leenhoff, his two brothers Eugène and Gustave, his brother-in-law Ferdinand Leenhoff, and friends and colleagues such as, among others, Duret, Antonin Proust, Émile Zola, Henri Fantin-Latour and Alfred Stevens; see 'Comité de l'Exposition Manet', in *Exposition Manet*, *op. cit.* (note 25), n.p.
 27. Duret, *op. cit.* (note 24), no.142, p.228.
 28. Tabarant, *op. cit.* (note 15), p.136.
 29. Harris, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.80.
 30. T. Reff, *Manet and Modern Paris*, exh. cat., National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1982, p.134.
 31. 'Copie pour Moreau-Nélaton de documents sur Manet ayant appartenu à Léon Leenhoff vers 1910', p.80; copy held in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Estampes et de la Photographie (Rés. Yb3-2401-8). The entry was incorrectly cited by Moffett in Cachin, et al., *op.*

- cit.* (note 7), p.264-n.14, to be from Mme Manet's account book, Tabarant archives, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.
32. At that time, the wealthy Charles Ephrussi was editor of the journal *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* and an art historian and critic. Manet knew both Charles and his brother Ignace but the buyer was more likely to be Charles.
 33. As seen, for example, in Ange-Louis Janet-Lange's *Néron disputant le prix de la course aux chars*. Exhibited in the 1855 Paris Salon, the painting is now held in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Chambéry, as *Néron au cirque*. An illustration after the painting appeared in *L'Artiste* (4th November, 1855, n.p., and described in a note on page 140). The image was noted by Michael Fried as a possible influence on Manet; see M. Fried, 'Manet's Sources: Aspects of his Art, 1859–1865', *Artforum*, 7, 1969, p.76-n.166. Other earlier images depicting frontal views of galloping horses include a lithograph, *Horse artillery of the Imperial Guard, changing position*, by Théodore Géricault, 1819; and, an English racing print, *Leamington Grand Steeple Chase, 1837: The Start*, by Charles Hunt after F.C. Turner, 1837, with, interestingly, a distinctive hill in its background.
 34. Moffett, for example, considered the Chicago Painting as "the first work in the history of art to depict a racing scene with the horses coming directly toward the viewer"; see Moffett, in Cachin, et al. *op. cit.* (note 7), p.262.
 35. Reff thought it displayed "more forceful, lunging movements and ...wider, more legible spacing"; see Reff, *op. cit.* (note 30), p.138; and, Moffett considered it "Manet's final distillation of the image"; see Moffett, in Cachin, et al., *op. cit.* (note 7), p.265.
 36. Musée d'Orsay, Paris, conservé au musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no.RF 30.452, recto. Other relevant sketches include: verso of RW.II-545, not catalogued; RW.II-546, and RW.II-547.
 37. Musée d'Orsay, Paris, conservé au musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, inv. no.RF 11.971, verso. Noted as "sketches of a head and of a scene showing a circus tent next to a clump of trees" in A. De Leiris, *The Drawings of Edouard Manet*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969, no.340, p.119.
 38. Noted to be in a private collection in Rouart and Wildenstein, *op. cit.* (note 17), I, no.96, p.98. Its present location is unknown. In the inventory made after Manet's death in 1883, the work was listed under "ESTIMATION DES TABLEAUX ÉTUDES" as: "61. Etude de courses.... 50.–Fr."; *ibid.*, I, p.27. The painting was photographed by Lochard in 1883 (no.32); see document Dc 300g-t.5, p.10, held in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des Estampes et de la Photographie, Paris. The prints of Lochard's photograph which are held in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, and in The Morgan Library and Museum, New York (the image of which was kindly sent to me by Juliet Wilson-Bareau), are certainly less clear than the photograph illustrated in Figure 8. Whether that is the result of a differing deterioration of the

prints or is evidence of a photograph taken by another photographer at a later date is an open question.

39. Reff, *op. cit.* (note 30), p.140.
40. Reff, *op. cit.* (note 30), p.138.
41. Dated "1864" in Tabarant, *op. cit.* (note 15), no.94, *Courses à Longchamp*, p.135; "1865" in Rouart and Wildenstein, *op. cit.* (note 17), I, no.97, p.98; "probably between 1865 and 1872" in Harris, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.80; "1872" in P. Jamot and G. Wildenstein, *Manet, Catalogue Critique*, Les Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1932, I, no.205, *Courses à Longchamp*, p.143; and, "1875–1877" in Duret, *op. cit.* (note 24), no.232, *Courses à Longchamp*, p.251.
42. *At the Races* was examined in October 2006 at the conservation department of the National Gallery of Art under a microscope and by means of X-radiographs and infra-red reflectography.
43. During 1863 events were held at Chantilly on 10th, 14th, and 17th May; 20th September; and, 18th October; see Le Secrétaire de la Société d'Encouragement (Jockey-Club): *Calendrier Officiel des courses de chevaux*, Paris, 1863, pp.161–75, 372–76, 399–403.
44. Information for the layout plan was derived from two plans, 'L'aménagement des pistes en 1846' and 'Les pistes et l'hippodrome en 1879' in P. Anselin, et al., *Chantilly et le cheval de course*, Ecomusée du Beauvaisis, Beauvais, 1986, pp.16, 17.
45. *Race Course at Longchamp* was examined in November 2006 at the conservation department of the Fogg Museum under a microscope and by means of infra-red reflectography and ultra-violet scans. There is sufficient continuity of washes and areas of gouache across the join line to confirm the imagery on the left-hand sheet was not created to match pre-existing washes on the right-hand sheet, or that washes across both sheets covered pre-existing washes on the right-hand sheet. Lack of an exact alignment of the sheet edges that exists along short sections of the join could be expected with the instability of the paper support, rather than indicate some trimming after the original sheet was cut or, indeed, that the two sheets had been initially separate and unrelated. However, the existence of gouache medium in some parts of the gap between the abutted sheets can only be partly explained as retouching after the two were reconnected.
46. Harris, *op. cit.* (note 2), p.81.
47. Reff, *op. cit.* (note 30), p.132. Michael Fried has also seen that division in terms of technique, claiming that Manet "exploited the division to juxtapose two fundamentally different modes of execution, the first, descriptive of the spectators, relatively careful and deliberate, the second, rendering the horses and their riders, extremely rapid and sketchy"; see M. Fried, *Manet's Modernism or, The Face of Painting in the 1860s*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1996, pp.321–22.
48. For a vivid description of the social rituals of dress and behaviour connected with such an event, including the standing women in their crinoline dresses, the two uniformed coachmen, and the women, holding raised parasols, seated in a Victoria carriage with a mounted cavalier behind; see Herbert, *op. cit.* (note 3), pp.152, 154–56, 158. The man with binoculars may also be thought a

typical figure captured by Manet, but Robin Spencer has shown he was 'borrowed' from William Powell Frith's painting *The Derby Day* (1856–58, Tate Britain, London); see R. Spencer, 'Manet, Rossetti, London and Derby Day', *The Burlington Magazine*, 133/1057, April, 1991, p.233. Spencer noted that it is not known if Manet had seen the then famous painting when exhibited in Paris in 1859, but suggested "Blanchard's engraving, or François's etching after it, could hardly have escaped his attention"; *ibid.*, p.232.

49. Juliet Wilson-Bareau also felt the background hill did not relate to the view from Longchamp and a joint search with her was undertaken in the Wimereux area north of Boulogne-sur-Mer in 2003.
50. Information for the layout plan was derived from: 'Plan Général de la ville de Paris et ses environs. 1866', by Avril frères, Paris 1866, held in the Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris, Paris; and, Carte topographique 2314OT (2003), Institut Géographique Nationale, Paris.
51. The computer-generated modelling was created with ground profiles formed from present-day contours and the grandstands from archival photographs and a series of contemporary architectural plan and elevation illustrations; see 'Le Bois de Boulogne: Chapitre VII: Travaux d'Architecture', in A. Alphand, *Les Promenades de Paris...*, Connaissance et Mémoires, Paris, 2002 (facsimile of 1867–73 publication), pp.65–88.
52. Information for the layout plan was derived from: 'Plan du Parc de Maisons-Laffitte', 1843, held in the Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris, Paris (It is the only document found in the research that shows a track configuration prior to the inauguration of the hippodrome with tribunes in 1878; as such, it is presumed the configuration in the 1860s was similar). and, Carte topographique 2314OT (2003) and 2313OT (2002), Institut Géographique National, Paris.
53. For a relevant history, see J. Barreau, *Maisons-Laffitte: Cité du cheval*, Editions Alan Sutton, Saint-Cyr-sur-Loire, 2007, pp.11–21.
54. On 9th November 1862, the race meeting involved gentlemen riders competing on an improvised cross country course beside the Seine; on 5th July 1863, three steeple chases were held; on 19th November 1863, one steeple chase and one 'pool' race; on 20th October 1864, three steeple chases; and, on 5th November 1865, two steeple chases and two flat races; see Barreau, *op. cit.* (note 53), pp.15, 16.
55. Development of the rural areas on the hill's lower slopes only occurred after the railway line was taken through in 1892.
56. The Fort de Cormeilles was built in 1875 on the western end summit of the hill's ridge, and its construction may have altered the summit's shape. It is noted that the two forms projecting above the skyline at the summit are far too large to be trees if depicted accurately. A windmill apparently existed on the summit at some stage, but no details of its existence have been found.
57. Wilson-Bareau thought the "similarity... suggests that the lithograph was based on a photograph of the lost canvas"; see Wilson-Bareau, in Cachin, et al., *op. cit.* (note 7), p.266.

58. Wilson-Bareau, however, has seen that continuation of the straight barrier in the lithograph to be "well below the lower limit of the original composition, altering the shape of the racetrack,..."; see Wilson-Bareau: '101. The Races', in Cachin, et al., *op. cit.* (note 7), p.267.
59. For details of the history of the church and spire, see M. and G. Martinez, *Saint-Cloud et les Clodoaldiens, 1789–1946*, Editions Alan Sutton, Saint-Cyr-sur-Loire 2002, p.35. The computer-generated view in Fig.4 diagrammatically depicts the church, at position *a*, as it existed in 1864 without its spire.
60. Catalogued as '41. The Races/ Les Courses' in J.C. Harris, *Edouard Manet, Graphic Works. A Definitive Catalogue Raisonné*, Collectors Editions, New York, 1970.
61. *Women at the Races* was examined in October 2006 at the conservation department of the Cincinnati Art Museum under a microscope and by means of X-radiographs.
62. Some of the numerals, particularly the last, have been abraded, but all those who participated in the examination concurred that the inscribed date was 1866. As the inscribed date on the Chicago Painting had been seen by this writer just the day before (see note 69, below), it was revealing to note how similar the two inscriptions were in both style and media.
63. Rouart and Wildenstein, *op. cit.* (note 17), I, no.94, p.98, and noted to be in a private collection in France. The last known sale was at the *Vente Gabriel Cognacq*, Galerie Charpentier, Paris in May 1952; see 'Manet (Édouard), No.45 *Pelouse du champ de courses à Longchamp*', sale cat. *Collection Gabriel Cognacq. Vente aux enchères publiques après décès de Monsieur Gabriel Cognacq*, Galerie Charpentier, Paris, 1952, n.p.
64. "Daté, 65" in Duret, *op. cit.* (note 24), no.69, p.209.
65. The photograph is held in the Documentation de la Conservation, Musée d'Orsay, Paris. Inscribed figures on the photograph's verso, "37 x 14.5", are presumably dimensions of the work.
66. Published in M. Gaillard, *Les Hippodromes*, La Palatine – Bibliothèque des Arts, Paris, 1984, p.90, with given dimensions of "36.5 x 14.3 cm".
67. See note 31, above.
68. Entry as "Ephrussi...Asperges...800^F"; see 'documents sur Manet', *op. cit.* (note 31), p.80.
69. *The Races at Longchamp* was examined in October 2006 at the conservation department of the Art Institute of Chicago under a microscope and by means of X-radiographs. All those who participated in the examination concurred that the inscribed date was 1866.
70. At that time a finish post with a circular ring at its top was not unique to Longchamp, with such a post depicted in a lithographic print of the Hippodrome de Versailles-Porchefontaine in 1864. No similar post has been found in contemporary archival images of Chantilly or Maisons-Laffitte.
71. Harris proposed its dimensions to be 102 by 260 cm.; see Harris, *op. cit.* (note 2), pp.80, 81; Fig.3, 'Reconstruction diagram of original canvas of *The Races*', n.p.. Reff later assessed its dimensions to be approximately 80 by 200 cm.; see Reff, *op. cit.* (note 30), p.132.

72. Postscript: A painting connected to Manet's project by its depiction of a horse-race at Longchamp brought a somewhat strange conclusion to his interest in the equine world. *The Races in the Bois de Boulogne* (RW.I-184), received as a commission and completed in 1872, shows its horses in the 'flying gallop' mode. After creating an image that countered the traditional view, it seems odd that Manet would revert to it. However, Berthe Morisot wrote in a notebook that, when discussing this work, Manet had stated "N'ayant pas ... l'habitude de faire des chevaux j'ai copié ceux qui savent le mieux les faire et maintenant tout le monde les critique" (see, *Carnet de B. Morisot 1885–1886 (Carnet Vert A)*, held at the Musée Marmottan Monet, Paris.). Notwithstanding the welcome income from a commission, it seems inconceivable that he would not first propose or offer a work connected to the earlier image. Not only may the Chicago Painting have been the first painting offered, but the commission, which was completed in October 1872, may have been received when Manet was more directly involved in the horse-racing project prior to the hiatus caused by the siege of Paris and the Commune during 1870–71. Although he made a trip to Holland in May–June of 1872 and Tabarant noted that the commission was "son premier travail dès qu'il rentra de Hollande" (A. Tabarant, *Manet et ses œuvres*, Gallimard, Paris, 1947, p.202), it is uncertain when the commission was actually received.
